

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

ASSENTED TO MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUR-REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO SCANSOFT'S EMERGENCY MOTION FOR REMEDIES AND TO SHOW CAUSE WHY DEFENDANT SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT FOR VIOLATION OF THE COURT'S PROTECTIVE ORDER

Defendant Voice Signal Technologies, Inc. (“Voice Signal”) moves, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(B)(3), for leave to file a short, five-page sur-reply further supporting its Opposition to ScanSoft’s Emergency Motion regarding the filing in court of a privileged document, solely for the purpose of addressing new arguments raised by ScanSoft, Inc. in its Reply in Support of its Emergency Motion to Show Cause Why Defendant Should not Be Held in Contempt for Violation of the Court’s Protective Order. Voice Signal believes that the sur-reply, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, will aid the Court in its determination of the issues presented in the parties’ papers.

WHEREFORE, Voice Signal respectfully requests leave of Court to file a sur-reply in the form attached as **Exhibit A**, and for the reply to be deemed filed upon allowance of this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

LAURENCE S. GILLICK, ROBERT S. ROTH,
JONATHAN P. YAMRON, MANFRED G.
GRABHERR and VOICE SIGNAL
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

By their attorneys,

/s/ Wendy S. Plotkin

Robert S. Frank, Jr. (BBO No. 177240)
Sarah Chapin Columbia (BBO No. 550155)
Paul D. Popeo (BBO No. 567727)
Paul E. Bonanno (BBO No. 646838)
Wendy S. Plotkin (BBO No. 647716)
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 248-5000

July 8, 2005

Certification Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1

I certify that counsel for Voice Signal attempted to confer with counsel for ScanSoft in an effort to resolve the issues presented in this motion and that counsel for ScanSoft assented to this Motion.

/s/ Wendy S. Plotkin